The Phenomenon Called Star: Bases of Emergence and Reasons of Popular Identification

Samarpita Ghosh-Ray

Principal, Vivekananda College for Women, Barisha, Kolkata, West Bengal.

Abstract

The phenomenon of star and the causes or bases of its emergence and popular identification is explored in this paper through a critical review of extant literature. The review examines the alternative explanation on this subject that posits reasons that are economic, sociological, cultural, historical and psychological in nature. An important component within the commodity complex of a film, a star is the prime attraction towards which the production value of the film is centred around as a gravitating force. The phenomenon of stardom, albeit a popular one is not a simplistic and thus is not explainable in any straitjacketed manner. It requires a deeper understanding of a discursive constructivist approach, the innate charisma of the star, the audience identification with a sacred object of totemic valences and a complementing superlative alter.

Keywords: Stars, Discourse, Appeal, Identification, Power, Charisma

Introduction

Film scholarship have sought to examine the reasons of emergence of star system and also explore the reasons of star popularity and the identification mobilized. The reasons have been which that consider it to be discursively constructed, deployed for commercial reasons as commodities, investment of charismatic potential, as embodiment or articulating tropes of prevalent socio-cultural values. The reasons are multiple and no singular explanation exhaustively or singularly succeeds to explain this popular mass enamouring phenomenon of the star and the magical frenzy or fandom surrounding it.

Who are stars? Richard Dyer as cited argues the star is the focus of the dominant cultural and his historical concerns, thus creating interest in the life of the star and his/her whole off-screen existence, to produce a star-text which is an amalgam of the real person, the characters played in films and the persona created by the media, which has an economic and institutional base. (Dyer,1979. p 94). l

Richard Dyer's search for Paul Robeson's crossover appeal among white audiences from 1920 to 1945 shows how star phenomenon includes everything- the films and publicity about star's private life – the performance and the person. Dyer identified stars as commodities, labour and the thing labour produces. First the star is a person, a body, psychology with skills to manipulate with the help of industry personnel – the director, screen, writer cameraperson make up artiste ,costume designer,

publicists and gossip magazine columnists who produce the image –and second, the star has personhood and a social reality (Dyer ibid,p.2-3)

Stars as charismatic persons, embodying in their existence a given time, are signifiers or condensers of certain ideological, moral, social values. In Hindi cinema's melodramatic texts wherein stars perform serve as sites wherein the star-texts are constructed. It is a cumulative process where each film draws upon the previous image(s)(Dwyer et al, 2002,p.32)

According to film scholar Moinak Biswas, a hero defines an era and exemplifies a paradigm. When society goes through a transitional phase, there is a constant conflict between desire and morality, stars, in their own way, hep to resolve these conflicts.Everey decade has its heroes who define and redefine the aspirations and demands of their times.(29-7-2012, Sunday Times Of India: 'The Superstar Phenomenon', Times Life(Sunday Times).

1. A sociological study of stardom necessarily involves an enquiry into the following factors or the condition for production of Stardom
2. (a)The general social conditions favouring stardom
3. (b)The role of forces of production and consumption shaping stardom and stars
4. © the ideological functioning of the star phenomenon

Looking into the condition for stardom both Franceso Alleroni and Barry King have suggested various structures that have led to or help to obtain phenomenon of stardom to exist. These conditions are necessary rather than sufficient,-that is, they automatically do not produce stars but are grounds on which stardom may be produced. (Dyer, 1986.p.6)

Alberoni is concerned with stars as social phenomenon and not just film stardom and this definition of stardom centres on the fact that stars are a group of people 'whose institutional power is very limited or non-existent, but whose doings and ways of life arouse a considerable and sometimes even a maximum degree of interest' (Alberoni as qtd in Dyer)The basic conditions for this phenomenon Alberoni suggests are

1. a state of law,
2. an efficient bureaucracy
3. a structured social system.

These three factors ensure that social roles are de-limited and assessed as per 'objective' criteria e.g. efficiency. In this situation, stars operate only in their own sphere and there is no danger of their 'charisma' becoming important 'from a political view point'. Stardom can exist under conditions as follows:

A. large scale society where stars cannot know everyone but everyone can know stars.
B. economic development above subsistence (though this is not always relevant as in India states Dyer).
© social mobility (anyone can in principle become a star).

Alberoni, mentions that stars as remarkable social phenomena-an elite, privileged group do not excite envy or re-sentiment (as anyone can in principle become a star) and ion the other hand have no access to political power. However, stars though cannot become crucial decision maker and lack political significance in conventional sense Alberoni like some ignores the conditions of significance for stars.(ibid.p.7) Because of this belief, the ideological significance of stars is often marked or

unaccounted. And some suggest that it is due to this marked character that values their political power of greater significance than resisted.

King following Alberoni argues that 'stars have a major control over the representation of people in society-and how people are represented as being in the mass media is going to have some kind of influence (even though of only reinforcement) on how people are in society. Stars enjoy a privileged position in definition of social roles and types and this must have real consequences in terms of how people believe they can and should behave.

King suggested certain preconditions that facilitate emergence of stars

1. production of surplus (i.e. commodities in excess of basic material needs)
2. development of a technology of mass communication
3. extensive penetration of the cultural sphere by industrialisation which leads to a separation between a system of action committed to instrumental goals (utilatarian and predominant) and a system of action committed to expressive goals (moralstic and subordinate).
4. rigid separation of work and labour division of role structure between expressive and instrumental decline of local cultures and development of mass culture, transformation from specific to universalistic modes of evaluation.
5. The organisation of the motion picture industry around commodity production and the progressive centralisation of control over production.
6. Relative rise in social industry into expressive role positions unconnected with sacred institution (which in feudal society constituted centres of power). (ibid.p.8)

The success of stardom and stars has been attributed to the manipulation of the market, analogous to the 'manipulation' of advertisements. This forms an extension of the economic argument on stars. Thomas Harris , as cited, argues that star images are manufactured and that the star system lends particularly well to the manipulative thesis since the industry invests enormous amount of resources in building the star image in addition to the various publicity mechanism like promotions, fan clubs etc. Harris' description of this process of star-construction was premised on the two instances of Hollywood stars: Grace Kelly and Marilyn Monroe. Commenting on the basic mechanisms for promoting the stars Harris observes as cited : '….a preliminary publicity build-up are a 'discovery' usually concocted by studio publicists, a series of glamour pictures sent to all the print media, a rumoured romance with another star already well known to the public, or a rumoured starring role in a major film. This publicity finds a primary outlet in syndicated Hollywood gossip columns and movie fan magazine. When the actor or actress is usually cast in a film, the studio assigns a 'unit man' to 'plant' items about the personality in these places as well as national magazines and Sunday newspaper supplements. A network television appearance is also a highly coveted plum in the studio 'pre-sale' campaign for both the picture and the personality. Prior to and during the filming of a picture all publicity emanates from Hollywood…..Especially important in this total process is the perpetuation of the star stereotype…'(Harris as cited in Dyer, 1979,p.13) Harris' arguments bring to fore the manufactured nature of stars-an elaboration of the film production apparatus. Dyer also notes the arguments of Edgar Morris who in similar vein says, as cited, 'The internal characteristics /of the star system /are the very one of grand-scale industrial, mercantile and financial capitalism. The star system is first of all fabrication. This is the word chosen instinctively by Carl Laemmle , the inventor of the stars. The fabrications of the stars is the fundamental thing in the film industry'. He further adds to say 'this merchandise is the very type of grand scale capitalism: enormous

investment, industrial techniques of rationalization and standardization of the system have effectively made the star as a merchandise destined for mass consumption'(as cited in Dyer, ibid.p.13)

Out of this emphasis on manufacture, as brought forth by Dyer, there develops a view of the star systems as 'pure manipulation'. This kind of an argument holds that both stardom and particular stars owe their existence solely to the machinery of their production. Also citing views of Daniel Boorstin from his book 'The Image' that holds stars a 'pseudo-events' of contemporary culture and empty of meaning, Dyer illustrates the constructed ness of the star phenomenon. Devoid of any intrinsic value or meaning, the 'star is well known for her or his well known ness and not for any talent or specific quality'. They are instances of marketing of 'celebrity', on the strength of trivial differences of appearances. Stars, as Boorstin observes, notes Dyer , do not possess a strong character, 'but definable, publicizable personality: which can become a nationally advertised trademark'. He adds that the 'qualities which now commonly make a man or woman into a nationally advertised brand are in fact a new category of human emptiness'. Boorstin's arguments are close to that of Herbert Marcuse's concept of the 'One Dimensional Man' where the culture of late capital is characterised by thin. pseudo, fabricated elements which Boorstin describes in the book.(ibid 15-16)

Notwithstanding the objections to the manipulation thesis, Dyer cogently argues that stars are constructions, or are manufactured. In addition to the views that considers stars as constructions or as manufactured, that there are views that hold 'that stars are stars because they are exceptional, gifted, wonderful etc' An extreme version of this was forwarded by Samuel Goldwyn, as cited by Dyer, wherein he argues: 'God makes the stars. It's up to the producers to find them'. Citing I.C. Jarvie, a sociologist Dyer quotes: '…striking photogenic looks, acting ability, presence on camera, charm and personality, sex appeal, attractive voice and bearing' .hence for Jarvie stars carry an intrinsic talent. Molly Haskel, too points notes Dyer that stars have 'some ' special qualities' and so '…in the midst of mediocre material, they rose to the surface and projected, through sheer will and talent and charisma, images of emotional and intellectual power'(ibid.p.18)

Dyer does not favour a complete reliance on the constructionist view of stardom and prefers it to be complemented by the view on star-charisma and argues in favour of a more balanced sociological approach. 'The enormous economic importance of the stars, the elaborate machinery of image-building and film's importance in establishing character-types all suggest the potential power of the forces of cinematic production for creating the star phenomenon. However, these explanations of the star phenomenon are not sufficient inthemselves, and we need to see the phenomenon in its cultural,historical and ideological context, to understand where the producer's ideas and images of stardom and of specific stars themselves come from…'(ibid.p.19)

One can raise a sociological polemics between Durkheim's idea of social fact, the constructionist view and Weber's idea of charisma. The star can be seen as an irreducible social fact, embodying the collective conscience as an extension of the same. The star can be said to be a representation of the society, an emblematic representation of the collective conscience ,the spirit of his times, or a 'human totem'-an object of secular deification, worship, valorisation and veneration for upholding the collective ideals(myths)of the society. Alternatively from a constructionist perspective the star can be said to be a part of a discourse, produced and reproduced discursively. While on the other there are views that uphold stars for their intrinsic worth and charisma, their innate charm, ability to perform, their talent that

attracts admiration, love, adore and following. If seen as Durkheimian social fact, embodying the collective conscience it creates difficulty over the question of stars as ordinary and stars as special. They enjoy the status of an extraordinariness compared to the Durkheimian sacred. Violette Morin, as cited, in Dyer suggests that in the case of superstars (in an article entitled 'Les Olympiens') they are thought to be distinct in kind from the other people. Morin sees this to emerge from the fact that 'stars are treated as superlatives'. 'Stars are always the most something or other in the world-the most beautiful, the most expensive, the most sexy. But because stars are dissolved into this 'superlative', are indistinguishable from it,…hence they seem to be of a different order of being, a different 'ontological category'. Their image become gradually generalised, so that from being the most beautiful, they become simply 'the greatest'(ibid,p.49)

The Origins of Stardom

It is hard for us today to de-link cinema from the production of celebrity. Yet in the early years of the medium in both Hollywood and in India, stars were not dominant in the industry. In Hollywood, the systems to produce film stars-to elevate film actors and actresses to the level of social icons-developed over decade during the early years of the American film entertainment film industry. At the inception of this industry, the discourse around cinema focussed primarily on the cinematic apparatus rather than people involved in film production. As documentary films yielded to fictional films as the principal cinematic format, around 1908 publicists in the cinema industry attempted to augment interest in the medium by stoking public curiosity about the off-screen lives of film actors. Initially publicists focussed on professional aspects of these individuals, but by around 1916, publicity agents had begun to divulge information to audiences about the personal lives of film actors and actresses (Jacob, 2010 ibid. 120)

'The history of movie stardom as an institution is a familiar one', states Richard Shickel in 'His picture in the Papers' and illustrates a very useful brief history of origins of stardom in Hollywood. :'......how the producers had resisted giving billing to the actors who played in their little films; how the actors themselves, regarding appearance in a medium that robbed them of what they regarded as their prime artistic resource their voice. had been glad to hide their shame in anonymity; how the public had begun singling them out of the crowds on the screen, demanding to know more about them, and more important, demanding to know in advance, which pictures featured their favourites; how a few independent producers grasping at any weapon to fight the motion pictures trust (composed of the major studios) had acceded to public opinion and had been rewarded by the most deliciously rising sales courses; how the demand of stars was quickly perceived as a factor that could stabilize the industry, since this demand was predictable in a way that the demand for stories or even genres was not; how, as feature length films established their popularity and the cost of producing these longer films required bank loans, star names came to lead the list of the collateral that bankers looked upon with favour when assistance was sought; how certain actors achieved unprecedented heights of popularity prosperity almost over night in the period 1915-1920, and how this phenomenon, this beginning of a new celebrity system destroyed or crippled almost everyone caught up in it......(Schickel, cied in Dyer ibid. p 9).

The key event in this narrative of history is usually taken to be Carl Laemmle's action of planting a story in the St. Louis Post Despatch to the effect that Florence Lawrence who till then was known as biograph girl was killed by a trolley car in St. Louis and following it a day later with an advertisement in the trade

press denouncing the story as a vicious life. This was the first occasion that a film actor's name came to be known in public. This was the first instance of deliberate manufacture of a star's image. Another argument, runs is the first example of film producers responding to public demand, giving public what they wanted. It is at the point of intersection of public demand (the star as phenomenon of consumption) and the producers' initiative of production (the stars as phenomenon of production) that stars emerged. Within the confines of the industry and market, there is little doubt that film stars are a phenomenon of consumption initially resisted strenuously in the first instance but mightily capitalised upon it once it was under way. The demand of audience for stars probably stemmed from the fact that it was already a part of popular theatre. As stars were part of the business of show, it was naturally that the same expectation would be there in cinema-as a demand from the audience of entertainment industry as a whole (Dyer, ibid.p.9-10).

Approaches to the Study of The Star System

In the Indian context the approach to the study of the star systems has its roots and its mobilizing authority in indigenous/Indian context The star image of Indian cinemas is a hybrid phenomena with origins both in ancient, indigenous theories of theatrical performance and aesthetic appreciation, referred to by the Sanskrit term, navarasa, or nine basic emotions, and in the Western tradition of melodrama that developed from the late 18th century. These two tradition of theatre, rasa and melodrama, structure the connotational dimensions of the cinematic image like poses, gestures, expressions and compositional lay outs.

There are points of intersection in theories on charismatic leadership and traditional Indian concepts of kingship. By welding these theories with these concepts one can understand the strategies obfuscating boundaries between off-screen and screenplay that allow stars to acquire certain divine like authority. To understand the passionate intensity bordering religiosity in public reception of their film star leaders, Jacob compares two particularly intense mode of gazing at cult images-the practice of darshan or gazing upon an image of divinity in Hinduism. From a comparison of these two ways of seeing images Jacob suggests that the viewing of Indian cinema encourages a dissolution of boundaries between the secular space of modern electronic media such cinema and the religious space of puja, or worship. Such a fluidity of perception is also essential to the realization of the charismatic power of the star or political image (Jacob ibid.p.12-13)

However as suggested, by Dyer, generally speaking there are two broad approaches to the study of stars – one is sociological and the other is the semiotic. The sociological approach centres on the stars as a remarkable, and probably influential as symptomatic social phenomenon, as well as being an aspect of film's industrial nature. It is a perspective, wherein films derive their significance from stars. The semiotic concern reverses this, wherein stars are of significance for being cast in films and therefore are part of the way films signify. However, both these concerns are mutually interdependent that is to say that sociological concern can only make a headway when informed by proper engagement of stars in various media texts (that includes films, news papers stories, television programmes, advertisements, etc.). This is because, sociologically speaking stars do not exist beyond texts or outside them, therefore such texts need to be studied with reference to its specities and significations. Equally, on the other hand, semiotic concern need to be informed by sociological factors because stars besides being significations

in textual formations are also social facts (Dyer,1979p.1) and that textual assumption are grounded in society.

The study of stars therefore entails a dialectical approach and a constant people are known to us as mediated phenomena, in terms of their signification and have to be seen in terms of their boundaries to the texts in which they appear. It is important to see them as social realities, signifying certain relationship to other aspects of social structure and values, the meaning of their images and values they embody, their function within texts and in relation to other aspects of texts.

The study of star phenomenon necessarily involves an understanding of ideology to affirm that there is no reality outside it (in an Althusserian sense). As a set of ideas and representations in which they live, ideology, characterises every human society, though is specific to a particular culture and at a particular moment in history. All ideologies are developed in relation to concrete, material circumstances of human life and are means by which knowledge is made out of those circumstances.

Our society is characterised by divisions along multiple dimension like class, gender, religious, cultural. Within these divisions which complexly intersect one another, sense is made out of the world, both collectively as well differentially. In other words all ideologies are rooted in the life activity of any given social groups within a given particular society, but that any group may produce several contradictory inflections of its ideology. In any society-and therefore in the ideas and representative of any given society – one can discern contradictions of two orders-between ideologies held by various groups in conflict (both actual and potential) and within each of these ideologies. Any dominant ideology in any society presents itself as the ideology of the society as a whole. Its task is to deny the legitimacy of alternative and oppositional ideologies and to construct out of its own contradictions a consensual ideology that will appear to be valid for all its members of society. The operations of the dominant ideology are therefore a ceaseless effort to make or displace its internal contradictions and those arising from alternative and oppositional ideologies. This dominant ideology tends to enter into the channels of popular and mass medium due to the fact that the medium engage with audiences who are not always situated within dominant positions of society. It is an attempt to secure hegemonic control that is under threat both from outside and its own contradictions.

The study of stars in Hollywood has been primarily located within an ideological understanding that seeks to situate the industry in a hegemonic position and whose ideological function lies in 'management' of this uneasily secured 'hegemony'. From ideological perspective analysis of stars existing in films and other media texts focuses on its structured polysemy, that is the finite multiplicity of meanings as foregrounded while others are marked or displaced. The concern of such ideological analysis is not to determine the correct meanings and affect, but to determine what can be legitimately may read in them i.e. the ideological manipulation of the meaning and affect, to secure hegemony. (Dyer,1979)

The study of stars as vehicles of hegemonic ideological formations as a general model also serve to explain the star function in Hindi films and several studies on stars have associated them with political regime or its discourse. For instance Raj Kapoor (Dissanayake,et al 1989) and Dilip Kumar(Desai,2004) have been read as Nehruvian heroes ,while Bachchan(DasGupta) as the cinematic parallel of the authoritarianism of Indira Gandhi. I would also like to include the indigenous theorization of Vasudevan on the secular function of star-text within Indian cinema, in particularly Hindi commercial films.

Vasudevan argues that in the context of popular Indian cinema there can be a different locus to think of sources for the outline of a transcendental subject. The non legitimate cultural form, often the object of elite derision and anxiety of state, posits a crucial problem for its power that images can exercise in circumstances of low literacy. This anxiety is also captured in the state's hostility, and indeed of elite public discourses, regarding the characteristic narrative forms of the popular cinema. Such hostility was manifest for long period in terms of crippling financial exactions and low cultural status. This non-legitimate cultural form nevertheless is a crucial vehicle of mass publicness. In occupying this position that of the mass public which lies beyond the borders of institutions legitimated by the state – the cinema's function is to provide a distinctive route for social imaginary. Its imaginary is composed at once of the reality of perceptual processes, the dematerialized nature of what is perceived, and perceiver. Cinema thus provides a fertile ground as a distinct field for the emergence of a transcendental subject. The spectator is transcendent not because part of civil social discourse but because he/she   access a distinct imaginary publicness. The spectator is invited to be out there in that imaginary domain of cinema, and to constitute a public not only as an addressee and audience, but as imaginary component of the fictional world.

There is an imaginary in relation to discourses pf secularism and cinema addresses the public as a critical fictional component (of this distinct imaginary publicness) via logic of co living, spectator subject as an undifferentiated virtual entity within the fiction and thirdly what is also most important to this matter is the exceptional agent, ie the heroic entity who shall posit a model of transcendence and also serve. This figure shall disseminate into psychologized character. as a figure . Crucial to this discourse is the star image. The star mobilizes a strategy of transcendence   premised on screen biography and the interpretive charge of performativity. The star constitutes a distinct component of the cinema's dematerialized imaginary. S/he is a virtual There is an imaginary in relation to discourses of secularism and cinema addresses the public as a critical fictional pre component (of this distinct imaginary publicness) via logic of co-living, spectator subject as an undifferentiated virtual entity within the fiction and third, what is most important to this discussion is the exceptional agent, i.e. the heroic entity who will provide a model for transcendence a figure who is both a type but also disseminate into individuated, psychologized character. Crucial to this is the discourse of star image. The star mobilizes a strategy of transcendence biographical entity who can only be made sense of in and through the screen constituting the spectator as a special vehicle of knowledge and interpretation in a metafiction of the star. Critical here, is the question of star performativity, where the compendium of actorly attributes – the repertoire of gesture, speech and bodily dimensions – may suggest both the distinctiveness of the star sign and possibilities of arbitrariness and interpretation. In the uniqueness of the star may be deployed to emphasize the non-identity of actor and character, making of the actor's body an arbitrary signifier not clearly attached to the social referent it may inhabit. Such arbitrariness may operate either through the armature of the individual film, or more complexly, across the screen biography of the actor /star. Vasudevan suggests two models, the first is the one where it is governed by consistent iconography, where the casting of the star may extend its foundational thematics into new territories of explorations without compromising the original codification, a stable secular iconization is thereby attained. The star an unanchored persona, dispenses with consistency of psychological characterization, facilitates transcendental drive while showing a consistent virtual screen biography that can be easily recalled from

spectator's memory. The second model of secular transcendence is opposed to the consistent logic of thematics and extension of the persona into different fields. It ruptures the screen persona and its continuum in what is a performative de-stabilization to produce a secularization through a differentia casting (often as the 'other')(Vasudevan,2010 p.134-136)

Theories of Identification with the Star on Screen

Psychoanalytic Discourse on Identification: Cinema links the auteur with the audience through the medium of the story, and the analysis of the story is therefore not direct, first hand or even second hand, but as Metz (1982) argues is possibly third hand. Metz argues that Freudian psychoanalysis and its emphasis upon oedipal complex is a delimited, singular approach of psychoanalysis to study cinema. Other types include the nosography approach (treating film as symptoms or as secondary manifestations from which one can work back), where the film maker is of primacy than the film or its fit into a typological classification on. In a psychoanalytic study of film script has its focus on manifest content and covert message. Cinematic signifier is perceptual along visual as well as auditory axis. The film as per Metz, is like a mirror where the viewer "sees" familiar household objects and perceives their significance. The viewer though not in the mirror, ie the cinematic frame, is able to recognize "his" world despite himself in it. This is most noteworthy aspect of cinema that turns it into a symbolic medium where the individual identifies with the fictional character and situation, yet within this setting is able to recognize the "other" who is externalized. That "Someone else" on the screen allows the viewer to place his or her ego in the imagination of the signifier. Any engagement with images arises from the collective unconscious (Bhurgra ,2006,ibid.p. 132). This allow us to argue how the heroic "other" i.e. the star in the form of fictional character in cinematic text allow for a collective identification through the reflective medium of cinema. It may be added that the intrinsic quality of a star's performativity and persona enables a broad and inclusive identification on the strength of its polysemic quality and also suitably personify the prevalent values of society and successfully express the desires and aspirations of the nation's or its collective psyche.

The psychoanalyst need to plot the dream's archetypal imagery against parallels drawn from religion, folklore, mythology works of art and other cultural artefacts in order to clarify the metaphorical context of dream symbolism on (Izod as cited in Bhugra). Izod argues that the significance of this method is that it can seek reduplication in interpretation of screen images.

Friedberg offers a three layered unconscious indentificatory processes involved in cinema : pre cinematic, cinematic and extra cinematic (Friedberg as cited in Bhurgra, ibid. p. 137) Identification with the actor and the director , or the story, is viewed in the context of how such information is secured. In describing pre cinematic identification, she argues that the assimilative relations between subject and object and their interactions are the key to the identity formation. Applying Freudian concepts of displacement, primary identification (the original tie with the ok object), secondary identification (the regressive way in which it becomes a substitute for libidinal object tie) and tertiary identification (the perception of a common quality), the patriarchal identification allows a degree of reliance on perception. Lacan's re-formulation of Freudian and post Freudian object relations insisted on the primacy of the visual and de-emphasized other routes of introjections (Freidberg, as cited in Bhugra ibid.p 137) Fenichel as observes Bhugra considers the process of ocular introjection incorporation through the eye

in addition to oral anal epidermal and respiratory introjections. Two directors of identificatory relations are identified by La Plancha and Pontalis (as cited by Bhugra ibid. p 137) heteropathic/centripetal (the subject identifies self with the other) and idiopathic/centrifugal (subject identifies other with self). The first type of identification is introjective   and the second is projective. It is on the introjective identification the cinema plays upon while providing the illusion of projective identification (Freidberg as cited in Bhugra,ibid 137).

Friedberg suggests that the film star is simultaneously (acknowledged) recognised as "other" and misrecognized as self. She calls the film star an "institutionally sanctioned fetish". This identification allows the receiver to peel layers of the story and understand by establishing confirming and learning to live with its message (Bhugra,2006 137-138).

Conclusion- The studies on stars reveal a fascinating range of analysis with each explanation seeking to look at the following factors of

A. as an economically motivated factor of deliberate deployment wherein extraneous causes are cited as a discursively constructed persona embodying and representing the spirit of prevalent ethos and dominant values of contemporary times
B. as a politically mobilized agent or trope expressive of a rhetoric, a mandate or a hegemonic political discourse
©as endowed with innate attributes upholding charismatic appeal

.Notwithstanding the various explanations, vis-à-vis emergence of star system, it remains that stars are invested embodiments attracting popular emotions and responses. The deep psychological identification with stars, their social currency and valency as sacred deified idols render them exalted to positions of secular Gods in the popular domain. Accounting their mass appeal and acclaim by innate qualities nor constructivist explanation together often fails to capture the elusive and inexplicable magicality of a star phenomenon.

References

1. Bhugra, Dinesh(2006)Mad Tales From Bollywood-Portrayal of Mental Illness in Conventional Hindi Cinema Maudsley Monographs New York, Taylor and Francis Group.
2. Desai, Meghnad(2004)Nehru's Hero Dilip Kumar in t
3. he Life of India,New Delhi, Lotus.
4. Dissanayake, Wimal and Malti Sahai(1989)Raj Kapoor's films:Harmony of Discourse.Delhi.Vikas Publishing Private Limited.
5. Dwyer,Rachel(2002)Yash Chopra: Fifty Years in Indian CinemaNew Delhi.Roli Books.
6. Dyer,Richard(1979)Stars,London,British Film Institute(BFI)
7. ……………..(1986) Heavenly Bodies-Film Stars and Society, New York, St.Martin's Press
8. Jacob, Preminda (2010) Celluloid Deities; The Visual Culture of Cinema and Politics in South India, Orient Blackswan, Hyderabad
9. Vasudevan, Ravi (2010) The Melodramatic Public- Film, Form and Spectatorship in Indian Cinema, Ranikhet, Orient Blackswan